

(14)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BOMBAY BENCH

Review Petition No.41/92

Original Application No. 102/90

Director (Regional)  
Western Region  
Bombay

.... Applicant.

V/s.

Shri Avinash V.Thulkar  
Nagpur.

Presiding Officer  
Central Govt. Industrial  
Tribunal, Bombay-1.

... Respondents.

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri U.C. Srivastava, Vice Chairman  
Hon'ble Shri M.Y.Priolkar, Member (A).

Tribunal's Order on Review Petition No.41/92

Dated: 8.4.92

¶ Per Shri Justice U.C. Srivastava, Vice Chairman¶

This Review application directed against the judgement and order dated 12.7.1991 has been filed by the Director (Regional) Western Region office of the Development Commissioner (Handicrafts) who was the Applicant to the Original Application. After hearing the counsels for the parties and going through the plea canvassed before us the original application was disposed of. The scope of review application is limited and but it does not go to the extent to rehearing the arguments or considering the same arguments even though worked differently. It also does not mean hearing of appeal against its judgement by the same Bench at the behest of any party. If some party is dissatisfied from a judgement which in its view *is erroneous, it can* approach the higher court for the same. The pleas that Shri R.K. Shetty was given two minutes time to argue apparently is incorrect. It may be because of some physical disability *he* may not advance lengthy

....2....

15

: 2 :

arguments in a case but for that such statements should not be made and be taken as a ground for review application. The plea of jurisdiction as raised or any plea as merits raised and canvassed has been considered by us and we do not find any error in the same much less <sup>any</sup> ~~than~~ error apparent on the face of the record and accordingly there are no grounds to review the judgement. The application is dismissed summarily.



(M.Y. PRIOLKAR)  
MEMBER(A)



(U.C. SRIVASTAVA)  
VICE CHAIRMAN

NS/